ISSN: 0703-8763

Edmonton Area Series Report No. 54

MIXED MOTIVATIONS FOR MIGRATION IN THE URBAN PRAIRIES: A COMPARATIVE APPROACH*

BY

Raymond F. Currie and Shiva S. Halli

Department of Sociology
The University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 2N2 CANADA

*Prepared for presentation in the Canadian Population Society Meeting, Hamilton, Ontario, June 3-5, 1987.

The 1981 Edmonton Area Study was administered and supported by the Population Research Laboratory and the Department of Sociology, The University of Alberta. This year's study was directed by Dr. L.W. Kennedy. In close cooperation with Dr. Kennedy, Raymond Currie of the Department of Sociology, University of Manitoba, and Charlene Thacker of the Department of Sociology, University of Winnipeg conducted a 1981 Winnipeg Area Study.

October 1987

ABSTRACT

Two Canadian Prairie cities, with populations of about 600,000 each, have experienced dramatically different growth patterns in the last twenty years because of quite different economic bases. Edmonton has been a fast growth city based on the gas and oil boom. Winnipeg has experienced very slow growth with a very diversified economy. Through the vehicles of the Edmonton and Winnipeg Area Studies, an analysis of migration to the two cities is a study of mixed motivation. Not only are single motives rarely expressed by respondents, but the relative strength of economic and family motives in particular is somewhat unexpected in the two cities. Finally, while return migration accounts for 50 percent of migrants in the slow growth city, it is not as detached from economic motives as appears to be the case in other Canadian research on return migration.

MIXED MOTIVATIONS FOR MIGRATION IN THE URBAN PRAIRIES: A COMPARATIVE APPROACH[1]

INTRODUCTION

A Canadian Manpower and Immigration publication suggests that Canadian internal migrants are moving from smaller to medium sized cities and from medium sized to larger cities (Manpower and Immigration,1975). A Statistics Canada publication adds "people tend to move to the larger urban complexes because of greater economic opportunities" (1980:6). From 1981 data we can see that inter-metropolitan migration is also a significant trend. At least half of the in-migrants to metropolitan areas had moved from other CMA's in Canada. The larger centres such as Toronto and Vancouver are especially attractive (McGahan, 1986:82).

In the Prairie region, the two cities of Winnipeg and Edmonton have been greatly affected by these population movements, particularly in the 1970's and early 1980's. At the turn of the Century, the population of Edmonton was only 2,626 compared to 48,488 of Winnipeg. Edmonton is now the largest prairie metropolitan centre, having surpassed Winnipeg in 1979. In the 30 year period from 1951 to 1981, Edmonton grew from 193,547 to 657,057. This was a growth of 239 percent, primarily due to the boom in the oil and gas industry. In the same period, Winnipeg grew from 357,229 to 584,842, a 64 percent increase. In the decade that ended in 1981 Winnipeg grew by only 8.2 percent (44,580), while Edmonton grew by 32.6 percent (161,355: see Kennedy and Mehra, 1985).

Migration played an important role in the pattern of growth of these two

cities. A migration preference index indicating the difference between actual and expected migration considering population size in the 1970's indicates that Alberta was the most desirable province of destination, while Manitoba was the seventh most attractive Province. Manitoba's preference index for out-migration was the second highest of all the Provinces (Statistics Canada, 1980:18). As a result, the minimal growth that did occur in Winnipeg can be accounted for by the net gain of births over deaths. During the decade, 1971-81, out-migration always exceeded in-migration to Winnipeg. The highest rate of net out-migration in twenty years was 1979, when it reached 15,457. A comparison of the motivations and selected characteristics of migrants to a fast changing economic environment such as Edmonton with migrants to a stable city such as Winnipeg should provide useful information for the study of social change.

THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The patterns of movement to these two cities suggest an economic explanation for internal migration, that is, a search for economic opportunity in the fast growth centre. The importance of economic opportunity as a causal factor was emphasized in early models of both international and internal migration (Stouffer, 1940). Opportunity in the receiving centre has often been viewed as the "pull" of the push-pull migration model which seeks to isolate factors accounting for migration flows. In fact, job-related motivations tend to differentiate migrants from short distance movers (Shryock and Siegel, 1973). A number of surveys have attempted to determine reasons for moving for the migrant population (Lansing & Mueller, 1967; Stone, 1979; Hiscott, 1987). Such research supplements the inferences made on reasons for

migrating by the literature which examines the selectivity of migrants and the comparative characteristics of areas of origin and destination.

Studies of migratory networks indicate that the migrant's networks in the urban area are in place before the migratory move occurs (Tilly & Brown, 1967; Fischer, 1976; Shulman and Drass, 1979). This suggests that the existence of social networks is a motivating factor for migration; or, at least, a support to the decision to migrate. A number of propositions may be derived from this perspective. First, migrants will tend to be attracted to areas where they have relatives. Even when those relatives are of no actual help, they are seen as a back-up system if the economic and social structure of the impersonal city should fail. Secondly, relatives will be a more important factor for the migrant of lower social class than for the migrant of higher social class. That is, the lower the social class of the migrant, the more important the presence of relatives in the area of destination. The rationale for this relationship is that the greater financial resources of the upper classes give them confidence in their abilities to cope economically during the transition period and to construct situations conducive to the formation of significant social relationships. Thirdly, relatives will be a more important factor for the older adult migrant than for the younger adult migrant. That is, there is a positive relationship between age and the importance of relatives' presence in the area of destination. The more elderly population, with less future life-time earnings and physical abilities and endurance projected, will perceive a back-up system of relatives (a married son or daughter in the area) as important. The younger populations look forward to longer future life-time earnings and more years of physical ability and endurance ahead. Thus, the perceived ability to cope and to

prosper in a new environment should differ by age. Likewise, the perceived need for a system of relational supports in the new environment should also differ by age.

Related to this theme of the auspices of migration, is research on return migration. Some migration is directed to regions with limited economic and employment opportunities (Richling, 1985; Hiscott, 1987). What is particularly interesting is that a substantial proportion of this is in fact return migration. In Hiscott's (1987) study of migration to Atlantic Canada from Ontario between 1976 and 1981 based on the Canadian census, slightly more than half were return migrants. In these circumstances the auspices of migration are particularly important, as well as other motives for migration such as the quality of life and the value system to be found in the area of one's origin (Richling, 1985). Even if economic reasons predominate in the decisions to relocate, returning and non-returning migrants tend to engage in different types of work. Returning migrants are over-represented in what can be called "traditional" Atlantic Canada employment (e.g. fishing and fish processing/packaging).

The selectivity of migrants is intimately connected to motivations. Migrants vary significantly from non-migrants both in the area of origin and the area of destination on certain important social and demographic characteristics (Stone, 1969). Indeed, Goldscheider (1971) has argued that it is precisely because migration movement has patterned social, economic and demographic determinants and consequences that the study of migration is sociologically important. The study of differential characteristics of migrants is also important to the community. As Stone writes: "The social and economic conditions of a Canadian community depend partly upon the

characteristics of the people who establish residence in it and the kinds of people who move out of it" (Stone, 1979:13). One could add that the kinds of people who move back to it also influence the conditions of the community.

The selectivity of migrants is theoretically related to the opportunity model described above. Economic opportunities draw or "pull" individuals, households, or groups with the characteristics disposing them to perceive and to take advantage of these opportunities. Furthermore, certain economic and social characteristics, for example, advanced age, act as constraints on those who might otherwise move in order to take advantage of economic opportunity. Of course, this model is limited to "voluntary" migration. There is a selective factor in forced migration as well, but that is not the concern of this paper.

There have been a number of significant attempts to arrive at generalizations concerning the selectivity of migrants (Thomas, 1938; Bogue, 1959; Lee, 1966, Schulman and Drass, 1979). These reviews of the diverse research on migration all highlight the importance of age. Migrants tend to be young adults. The age factor has been linked to stage in the family life cycle as a determinant of mobility. The stage of family formation, coinciding with the period of young adulthood, appears to be a particularly potent combination for residential movement in general, as well as migration in particular. We might posit that the "pull" of economic opportunity is most attractive to those who have most to gain in terms of future life-time earnings and amenities and to those whose family formation and expansion disposes them to residential mobility of some kind. These are essentially the young adults. For others, age and stage in life cycle may act as a constraint in regard to migration. This is particularly true for the elderly, when one

controls for social class. In addition, those who are potentially upwardly mobile, who have the necessary skills and educational requirements (George, 1970; Stone, 1979; Bogue, 1969; McVey, 1978) to take advantage of opportunity, are more likely to be migrants.

The above discussion can be categorized under the general topics of motivational components and selectivity of migration. The purpose of the present paper is to explore the two 1981 Area Studies of Winnipeg and Edmonton to try to understand the migration phenomenon of the two prairie cities within the framework outlined above. The study deals with only last five year migrations in order to be consistent with other studies based on census data.

METHODOLOGY

The 1981 Winnipeg Area Study was the initial year of what was to become an almost annual survey of the city of Winnipeg. The Edmonton Area Study began in 1977 and has been repeated every year since then. In 1981 the sampling procedures and the questionnaire were identical in the two cities. The special topic was "rural-urban migration". The questions included important factors that were expected to influence the decision to migrate. In addition, the questionnaire contained a number of replicated questions on quality of life and demographic and socio-economic characteristics from previous Edmonton Area Studies.

Sampling Design

Population

The 1981 Winnipeg Area Study population universe was designated as all

dwelling units that were listed in the 1980 assessment file for the City of Winnipeg.

Sampling

A simple random sample of 457 addresses for personal interviewing was selected from a computerized list of addresses compiled by the City Planning Department, City of Winnipeg, for the 1980 assessment. Nursing homes and temporary residences were deleted from the sample. The household was the primary sampling unit.

Within the household one eligible person was selected as the respondent for the one hour interview. A person was eligible to be the respondent if the dwelling was his/her usual place of residence and he/she was 18 years of age or older.

Because of a concern that women were more likely to be home and thus be oversampled, interviewers were instructed to make first contact with the household between 4 and 8 p.m. or on week-ends. They were to request to talk to the male head of the household in the first third of the interviews; thereafter, either the male or the female head of the household was interviewed.

Data Collection

There were 336 respondents for a response rate of 74 percent. A series of careful checks revealed no significant discrepancies or irregularities in the interviews. Refusals came from all age groups, but the most frequent were from the 35-44 and over-65 age groups. Fifty-eight percent of refusals came from single dwelling units (the 1981 census indicated that 59 percent of

households in the city were single dwelling units).

Demographic Profile

Of the respondents, 59 percent were female and 41 percent male, compared to 53 percent female and 47 percent male (over 20 years of age) in the 1981 census. The median age of the Winnipeg sample was 43 years. Sixty-four percent of the sample lived in a single dwelling unit compared to 59 percent according to the census.

Single respondents made up 21 percent of the sample, while 59 percent were married or living common-law. Nine percent were divorced or separated and 11 percent were widowed.

A comparison was made between the sample and the 1981 census distribution for the size of the household and the age of the respondents. The sample tends to underrepresent the 2 member households and overrepresent the 4-5 member households. The age distribution is very comparable to the census data. Additional information on the sampling and selected findings of the study can be found in Currie and Thacker (1982).

Edmonton Area Study

As mentioned above, the Edmonton Area Study used an identical sampling procedure and questionnaire in 1981. The sample size was slightly larger however. There were 400 respondents for a completion rate of 75 percent. Details of the sampling, the representativeness of the sample and selected findings can be found in Kinzel (1981). While the two 1981 surveys are the major source of data, later Area Studies will be referred to briefly in the analysis.

ANALYSIS

It should be mentioned that in this paper migration status is observed for those who have migrated to the city during the previous five years (1976-81). A fundamental limitation of the paper is that there are only 119 eligible migrants out of sample size of 400 in Edmonton (30%) and only 57 out of sample size of 336 in Winnipeg (17%). Though the absolute numbers are small their corresponding percentage are quite close to the figures that are estimated based on other large data sets (Tepperman 1985; Bender,1986). Nevertheless, it is wise to consider the project as almost a case study. For that reason tests of significance will not be reported. The analysis will emphasize a comparison between the two cities.

Table 1 reveals the importance of age and sex variables. As one would expect migrants tend to be younger in both the cities. However, there are no significant differences in both the cities with respect to sex. Especially in the case of Edmonton this could be simply that most migrants are either married or living together as indicated in the same table. Tepperman (1985), who uses a different data source in his study of the occupational experience of migrants in Alberta, 1976-1980, also found that many of the migrants were married and migrated to Edmonton to pursue job opportunities for one member of the family. We did not find this pattern in the case of Winnipeg, where migrants were equally likely to be single or married. Their reasons for migration will be considered shortly.

To understand migration one must consider the relationship between migration and socio-economic variables. The remaining part of Table 1 provides the association between education, occupation and income variables and migration. In both the cities, migration is associated with higher

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF LAST FIVE YEARS MIGRANTS BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS, 1981

Characteristics		Edmonton N	Edmonton %	Winnipeg N	Winnipeg %
Age	18-24	43	(36.8)	22	(38.6)
	25-34	43	(36.8)	24	(42.1)
	35+	31	(26.5)	11	(19.3)
	Total	119	(100.0)	57	(100.0)
Sex	Males	64	(53.8)	28	(49.1)
	Females	55	(46.2)	29	(50.9)
	Total	119	(100.0)	57	(100.0)
Marital Status	Single	37	(31.1)	25	(43.9)
	Married & Common-Law	71	(59.7)	25	(43.9)
	Divorced, Separated and Widowed	11	(9.2)	7	(12.3)
	Total	119	(100.0)	57	(100.0)
Level of Education	Primary or No Schooling	4	(3.4)	1	(1.8)
	Secondary	57	(47.9)	26	(45.6)
	University	58	(48.7)	29	(50.9)
				1	(1.8)
	Total	119	(100.0)	57	(100.0)
Type of Occupation	Professional, Managerial and Teaching	39	(32.8)	22	(38.6)
	Service, Sales and Clerical	40	(33.6)	18	(31.6)
	All other occupations	40	(33.6)	17	(29.8)
	Total	119	(100.0)	57	(100.0)
Household Income	$0-14,999	19	(16.0)	18	(31.6)
	$15,000-24,999	32	(26.9)	19	(33.3)
	$25,000-39,999	29	(24.4)	10	(17.5)
	$40,000+	22	(18.5)	5	(8.8)
	Missing Cases	17	(14.3)	5	(8.8)
	Total	119	(100.0)	57	(100.0)

education. This has been the finding in most of the migration research (Trovato and Halli, 1983). It is also associated with a slightly higher representation of migrants in professional and managerial occupations in Winnipeg compared to Edmonton. Edmonton income, however, is higher. According to the 1981 census, the average family income was $31,998.00 in Edmonton compared to $26,715 in Winnipeg. It is also possible that the economic boom in Edmonton might have provided job opportunities for more of the family members. In fact, at the time of the survey, 30 percent of the migrants to Edmonton were married with husband and wife both working full time(2). Only 9 percent of migrants to Winnipeg were in a similar situation.

Some of the most important pieces of information about the migrants in the two surveys are the reasons for migration. The respondents were provided with 25 possible reasons for their decision to migrate. These were listed on a card presented to the respondents. There were two separate questions, one meant to identify the first factor in influencing their decision to migrate and the other, the second most important factor. The responses for these factors by the migrants are presented in Table 2. It should be noted that the same card was presented to the respondents to inquire about residential mobility as well as migration. Given the short distance of many migrating moves (Shulman & Drass, 1979) it was appropriate to ask about a variety of motivations, even those more often associated with mobility. Since the frequencies are so small, it is wiser to group these 25 reasons into broader categories. The purpose of including Table 2 is to give an idea regarding type of reasons considered in order to understand the motivational aspects of migrants.

Table 3 reveals the important reasons for migration for both Edmonton and

Table 2

DISTRIBUTION OF LAST FIVE YEARS MIGRANTS ACCORDING TO THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR IN INFLUENCING THE DECISION TO MIGRATE, 1981

	Edmonton		Winnipeg	
Factor Ranked as Number One and Two	Number one N %	Number two N %	Number one N %	Number two N %
Loss of employment	5(4.2)	3(2.5)	4(7.0)	----
Job transfer	9(7.6)	5(4.2)	13(22.8)	3(5.3)
Job opportunities	38(31.9)	25(21.0)	16(28.1)	6(10.5)
Marriage	13(10.9)	2(1.7)	1(1.8)	-----
Lower commuting	1(0.8)	2(1.7)	----	1(1.8)
Access to school	----	----	----	2(3.5)
Educational opportunities	20(16.8)	13(10.9)	8(14.0)	3(5.3)
Climate	----	1(0.8)	----	3(5.3)
Cost of living	2(1.7)	----	1(1.8)	3(5.3)
Cost of housing	----	2(1.7)	----	1(1.8)
To own property	1(0.8)	----	----	----
To live in single dwelling unit	----	----	----	1(1.8)
Friendly community	1(0.8)	2(1.7)	----	1(1.8)
More privacy	1(0.8)	1(0.8)	----	2(3.5)
Closer to family	11(9.2)	6(5.0)	6(10.5)	8(14.0)
Further from family	2(1.7)	9(7.6)	----	----
Want more space	----	1(0.8)	----	3(5.3)
Quality of unit	----	1(0.8)	----	----
Family move	2(1.7)	4(3.4)	1(1.8)	4(7.0)
Retirement	----	1(0.8)	1(1.8)	----
Family reasons (unspecified)	2(1.7)	1(0.8)	1(1.8)	1(1.8)
Opportunities in Edmonton/ Winnipeg (unspecified)	1(0.8)	1(0.8)	1(1.8)	----
Closer to friends	1(0.8)	2(1.7)	1(1.8)	----
Change desired	7(5.9)	6(5.0)	1(1.8)	2(3.5)
Other	2(1.7)	3(2.5)	1(1.8)	1(1.8)
Nothing	----	28(23.5)	----	11(19.3)
N/A	----	----	1(1.8)	1(1.8)
Total	119(100.0)	119(100.0)	57(100.0)	57(100.0)

Table 3
DISTRIBUTION OF LAST 5 YEARS MIGRANTS ACCORDING TO THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTORS IN INFLUENCING THE DECISION TO MIGRATE, 1981

Reasons for Migration	Edmonton First Factor	Edmonton Second Factor	Winnipeg First Factor	Winnipeg Second Factor
	N %	N %	N %	N %
Employment				
Loss of employment	5(4.2)	3(2.5)	4(7.0)	
Job transfer	9(7.6)	5(4.2)	13(22.8)	3(5.3)
Job opportunities	38(31.9)	25)21/0)	16(28.1)	6(10.5)
	52(43.7)	33(27.7)	33(58.9)	9(15.8)
Family				
To be closer	11(9.2)	6(5.0)	6(10.5)	8(14.0)
To be further	2(1.7)	9(7.6)	----	----
Family move	2(1.7)	4(3.4)	1(1.8)	4(7.0)
Marriage	13(10.9)	2(1.7)	1(1.8)	----
Other family reasons	2(1.7)	1(0.8)	1(1.8)	1(1.8)
	30(25.2)	22(18.5)	9(16.1)	13(22.8)
Educational Opportunities	20(16.8)	13(10.9)	8(14.3)	5(8.9)
Other	17(14.2)	23(19.3)	6(10.7)	18(32.1)
Nothing (no second reason given)	----	28(23.5)	----	11(19.3)
	119(100.0)	119(100.0)	56(100.0)	56(100.0)

Winnipeg. As expected, the economic reasons stand out as the most influencing factors in migration for both the cities, followed by family reasons and educational opportunities. Although economic reasons are important in the decision to migrate, these reasons quite often may be only necessary conditions. In addition, the migration decision maker may not always be an individual, but rather be part of a family unified by common interests. Migration actors act with, but also party against, other demographic actors with whom they have close and enduring social ties. For these reasons, Table 4 has been constructed by crossclassifying the first most important factor in influencing migration against the second most important factors. The table exemplifies the sole importance of economic reasons for migration along with their combined effect with other important reasons.

Table 4 identifies respondents who have given only economic reasons for migrating to Edmonton and Winnipeg as relatively few, 17.6 percent (21 cases) and 19.6 percent (11 cases) respectively. It is possible to calculate the respondents who report economic reasons as the first of two factors. This adds an additional 26.1 percent and 39.3 percent (31 cases in Edmonton, 22 cases in Winnipeg). Economic reasons as the second of any two factors also adds 20.1 percent for Edmonton and 8.9 percent for Winnipeg. The results are surprising in the sense that economic reasons stand out more prominently in moves to Winnipeg (67.8 percent) than in moves to Edmonton (62.6 percent). While these differences are not great, one would have expected any differences to reflect greater economic priority to be given to moves to Edmonton.

Two differences between the cities are notable. First, moves to Winnipeg are almost as likely to be job transfers as job opportunities, while moves to Edmonton are far more likely to be job opportunities than job transfers (Table

Table 4
ASSOCIATION BETWEEN TWO MOST IMPORTANT FACTORS IN INFLUENCING DECISION TO MOVE TO EDMONTON/WINNIPEG, 1981

	Edmonton	Winnipeg
	N %	N %
Only Economic Reasons	21(17.6)	11(19.6)
First Economic, second Family	5(4.2)	6(10.7)
second Education	7(5.9)	2(3.6)
second Other	19(16.0)	14(25.0)
	52(43.7)	33(58.9)
Only Family Reasons	10(8.4)	3(5.4)
First Family, second Economic	7(5.9)	1(1.8)
second Education	3(2.5)	2(3.6)
second Other	8(6.7)	3(5.3)
	28(23.5)	9(16.1)
Only Education	6(5.0)	1(1.8)
First Education, second Economic	7(5.8)	2(3.6)
second Family	4(3.4)	4(7.1)
second Other	3(12.5)	1(1.8)
	20(16.8)	8(14.3)
Only Other Reasons	5(4.2)	1(1.8)
Other First, second Economic	10(8.4)	2(3.6)
second Family	1(0.8)	2(3.6)
second Education	3(12.5)	1(1.8)
	19(15.4)	6(10.7)
	119(100.0)	54(100.0)

2). There is no doubt that Alberta experienced unparalleled economic opportunities even in comparison with the economies of eastern Canada. This would lead to job openings that would not necessarily be job transfers (3). Manitoba, as a relatively low wage, low income province, found it difficult to compete with its neighbours. Any major growth of the national economy tended to mean that the economies of other Provinces improved still more than Manitoba's. For that reason, it is not surprising to note that job transfers, or the assurance of economic security, would be more important in moves to Winnipeg than to Edmonton, where perceived opportunities were often sufficient motives for migration.

A second difference between the cities is that in spite of the almost equal frequency of reporting economic reasons for migrating, in answer to another question migrants to Winnipeg were less likely to report they "moved in order to improve their financial situation" (39 percent compared to 55 percent). Of the three economic reasons possible, (loss of employment, job transfers or job opportunities) only job opportunities were clearly associated with moves to improve one's financial situation, and this occurs only when it is the first motive for moving. In other words, keeping in mind that the sample is small, the data suggests it would be simplistic to assume that all economically motivated moves are necessarily made to improve one's financial situation.

Family reasons are more frequently given in moves to Edmonton than Winnipeg. While the number of cases is small (41 cases for Edmonton, 22 cases for Winnipeg) there are some patterns worth noting. Those moving for family reasons are much more likely to have been born outside of Canada when the destination is Edmonton rather than Winnipeg (46% versus 14%). Those born in their own Province who have moved to Edmonton or Winnipeg show exactly the

opposite pattern (24% versus 59%). Parenthetically, it is also interesting to note that 10 other respondents in Edmonton (which is 9.2% of the migrants) report that they in fact moved to Edmonton to be further from their family. These respondents are not included in the family motives listed above.

In the context of analysing the migrants for family reasons we checked on the frequency of return migration to the cities. Data from the 1981 Winnipeg Area Study, confirmed in the 1984 and 1986 Winnipeg Area Studies, have revealed that an average of 50 percent of all migrants to Winnipeg since 1976 are in fact return migrants. The pattern is relatively consistent for each individual year except 1976 and 1985 (Table 5). The 1981 and 1987 Edmonton Area Studies provide a point of comparison. For those arriving in Edmonton since 1976, 30 percent are return migrants. However, it is noteworthy that between 1976 and 1981, the boom years, only 29 percent of migrants to Edmonton were return migrants. The economy began to decline in the middle of 1981, shortly after the survey was conducted. In 1982 few migrants appear in the sample. Between 1983 and 1986, at the height of the weaker economic times, the percentage of return migrants increased fairly consistently to a high of 41 percent, with an average of 37 percent. In other words, as the economy of Edmonton took a downturn, a higher percentage of those arriving were return migrants.

This suggests that migrants to a slow growth area are more likely to include a higher percentage of return migrants. This is consistent with Richling (1985) and Hiscott (1987). This does not necessarily mean that economic reasons are less important than other reasons for the moves in slow economic times, although Richling (1985) suggests return migration to Newfoundland appears to be linked to non-economic factors. As we have seen

Table 5

RETURN MIGRANTS AS PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL MIGRANTS TO WINNIPEG AND EDMONTON 1976 TO 1986

Year of last arrival	Year and Location of Survey: Winnipeg Area Study 1981 R	T	Winnipeg Area Study 1984,86 combined R	T	AVG* % Return	Edmonton Area Study 1981 R	T	Edmonton Area Study R.T. R	T	Ave. % Return
1976	2	4	9	33	30%	5	16	4	12	32%
1977	4	8	11	19	56%	5	23	3	10	24%
1978	8	15	10	19	53%	5	22	5	16	26%
1979	1	6	13	22	50%	1	21	4	14	14%
1980	9	19	22	41	52%	7	29	4	20	22%
1981	3	3	19	43	48%	2	8	1	8	19%
1982	-	-	14	35	40%	-	-	2	7	29%
1983	-	-	17	31	55%	-	-	5	19	26%
1984	-	-	16	27	59%	-	-	7	18	39%
1985	-	-	16	23	70%	-	-	9	24	38%
1986	-	-	--	--	---	-	-	12	29	41%
Totals	27	55	147	293	50%	25	94	56	177	30%

R - Actual number of return migrants
T - Total migrants
AVG % Return - Average percent return migrants for all three Winnipeg surveys and two Edmonton surveys.

above, economic reasons were given more frequently in moves to Winnipeg than Edmonton.

Furthermore, return migration does not differentiate within economic reasons. We expected that perhaps the higher percentage of return migrants would account for the higher percentage of job transfers to Winnipeg compared to Edmonton, but that was not supported. Rather it simply suggests to us that slow growth areas are attractive to a narrower range of possible migrants, including especially those familiar with, and with relatives in the region. Those who do settle there may nevertheless say they do so predominantly for economic reasons.

A measure of the importance of relatives in the area was the frequency of interaction with relatives. Migrants to Winnipeg are more likely to see relatives at least 1 to 3 times a month than are migrants to Edmonton (61 percent compared to 48 percent). The difference is entirely accounted for by the larger number of return migrants to Winnipeg. While 41 percent of the first time migrants to both cities report seeing relatives at least 1 to 3 times a month, return migrants to Winnipeg are more likely to see relatives that frequently than are return migrants to Edmonton (85 percent compared to 72 percent).

A second family indicator of some importance was the number of immediate family members (grandparents, parents, in-laws and children) over 65 years of age. In both cities, 20 percent of the migrants report relatives of that age group in the city. Even the return migrants to the two cities report 35 percent of their relatives over 65 live in the city. The only difference appears to be that migrants to Winnipeg are more likely to report that a large percentage of their total elderly relatives live in the city (47 percent

compared to 35 percent).

The third set of motivations for migration are related to education. Again, there are differences between the two cities. Edmonton's migrants for educational reasons were fairly evenly split between those coming from within the Province (32%), those from elsewhere in Canada (39%) and those from outside the country (29%). The major difference between the cities is that most of those who moved to Winnipeg for educational reasons came from within the Province (54 percent). Once again, Winnipeg appears to have been less attractive than Edmonton for outsiders. Only 15 percent came from other Provinces for educational reasons. On the other hand, 31 percent came from outside of Canada. The fact that the University of Manitoba does not charge higher rates for foreign students contributes to the relatively high percentage of those from outside the country coming to Winnipeg for educational purposes.

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Based on the 1981 Edmonton and Winnipeg Area Studies we have presented some data on the selectivity of migrants and the motivational factors for migration. While the sample sizes are small, and the results are therefore tentative, several patterns deserve attention.

Economic reasons are clearly the most important reasons given for migration in both cities, although this research suggests the issue is somewhat complex. First, very few respondents in either city give only economic reasons. Mixed motivations are the norm. Second, given the dramatic differences in the growth patterns of the two cities, it is rather noteworthy that migrants to Winnipeg mention economic reasons slightly more frequently. On the other

hand, migrants to Winnipeg are less likely to state they moved to improve their financial situation.

Third, it should be noted that even when Edmontonians list family motives, in a wider sense these are rooted in the larger economic potential of Edmonton as a location. The data suggests that in earlier days, even the recent past, families or individuals came to Edmonton because of good economic times and now attract other members of their family. This is confirmed by the higher percentage of migrants to Edmonton than those to Winnipeg coming for family reasons who were born outside of Canada or outside the Province. Yet once again there is a modifier. Migrants to Winnipeg report seeing their relatives more frequently, and have a higher percentage of all their elderly relatives living in the city even though a lower percentage give family reasons for their move.

Those moving for educational reasons are in a strong sense also linked to economics, since it is the good economic climate which has supported education. Thus, again Edmonton is more attractive than Winnipeg for educational goals to those from outside the Province.

One must be careful to distinguish between the stated motivations of the respondents and the underlying economic climate that will also have a significant bearing on the migration patterns. The extent of return migration particularly to Winnipeg, but also to Edmonton, suggests that occupational opportunities or transfers may in fact also be a chance to return to the place where respondents felt they had some roots. In support of this Argument, Currie and Thacker (1986) found in this same 1981 survey that although subjective economic variables ("good economic climate" and "good chance to get ahead") received a higher mean score among Edmonton residents than Winnipeg

residents, they were not significant predictors of overall community satisfaction in either city. In addition, these economic perceptions were not statistically significant in the regression equation set up to predict the likelihood of residents deciding to stay in their city rather than move.

In brief, Winnipeg as a destination is situated somewhat between Edmonton, a booming economic centre at the time, and the Atlantic region, a more depressed economic area. Like Edmonton, it can attract some for job transfers and even economic opportunities; like the Maritimes, it is particularly attractive to those already familiar with the area. While the economic climate clearly has a most significant bearing on migration decisions, it may not always be directly perceived or expressed by respondents. In no case should it be viewed in isolation from other factors.

FOOTNOTES

1. The authors gratefully acknowledge financial assistance from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, the Population Research Laboratory at the University of Alberta, the Research Boards of the Universities of Manitoba and Winnipeg and Health and Welfare Canada. The authors also thank Zachary Zimmer for his research assistance.

2. This observation does not detract from Tepperman's findings that women migrating to Alberta tend to be "underemployed, in terms of their skills and past employment, as well as in terms of hours (part-time, versus full-time work) nor does it contradict Kennedy and Mehra (1985).

3. These findings for Edmonton are consistent with Tepperman's (1985) research. He reports that large numbers of migrants to Alberta actually changed industries as well as occupations after their arrival, and most did not achieve significant upward mobility as might be expected. This was especially true for women, as noted above.

REFERENCES

Bender, Rosemary K.
1986 "Recent Trends and Variations in Migration Flows for Manitoba and Its Census Divisions". Presented at the Canadian Population Society Annual Meeting, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Bogue, Donald J.
1959 "Internal Migration". In The Study of Population, Edited by Philip Hansen and Otis D. Duncan. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bogue, Donald J.
1969 Principles of Demography. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Currie, Raymond F. and Charlene Thacker
1982 Selected Findings From the 1981 Winnipeg Area Study. Edmonton Area Series Report No. 22.

Currie, Raymond F. and Charlene Thacker
1986 "Quality of the Urban Environment as Perceived by Residents of Slow and Fast Growth Cities", Social Indicators Research, 18: 95-118.

Fisher, Claude S.
1976 The Urban Experience. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

George,M.V.
1970 Internal Migration in Canada: Demographic Analyses. Ottawa: Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

Goldscheider, Calvin
1971 Population, Modernization and Social Structure. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Hiscott, Robert D.
1987 "Recent Migration From Ontario to Atlantic Canada: A Comparison of Returning and Non-Return Migrants." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology (Forthcoming).

Kennedy, Leslie W. and N. Mehra
1985 Moving to Get Ahead: Does it Pay. Edmonton Area Series Report No. 45.

Kinzel, Clifford.
1981 Selected Findings From the 1981 Edmonton Area Study. Edmonton Area Series Report No. 20.

Lansing, John B. and Eva Mueller
1967 The Geographic Mobility of Labour. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan.

Lee, Everett.
1966 "A Theory of Migration", Demography, 3: 47-57.

Manpower and Immigration.
1975 Internal Migration and Immigrant Settlement (mimeograph)

McGahan, Peter
1986 Urban Sociology in Canada (second edition). Toronto: Butterworth & Co.

McVey, Jr., Wayne
1978 "Migration and the Smaller Community", Canadian Studies in Population, 5:13-23.

Richling, Barnett
1985 "You'd Never Starve Here: Return Migration to Rural Newfoundland", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 22(2): 236-49.

Shryock, Henry S., Jacob S. Siegel and Associates.
1973 The Methods and Materials of Demography. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Shulman, Norman and Robert Drass
1979 "Motives and Modes of Internal Migration: Relocation in a Canadian City", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 16(3): 333-42.

Statistics Canada.
1980 Canada's Cities. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada.

Statistics Canada.
1980 International and Interprovincial Migration in Canada, 1978-79. Ottawa:
Supply and Services Canada.

Stone, Leroy O.
1969 Migration in Canada: Some Regional Aspects. Ottawa, Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

Stone, Leroy O.
1979 Occupational Composition of Canada Migration. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.

Stouffer, Samuel A.
1940 "Intervening Opportunities: A Theory Relating Mobility and Distance", American Sociological Review, v: 845-67.

Tepperman, L.
1985 "Musical Chairs: The Occupational Experience of Migrants to Alberta, 1976-80", Social Indicators Research, 16: 51-67.

Thomas, Dorothy Swaine
1938 Research Memorandum on Migration Differentials. New York: Social Science Research Council.

Tilly, Charles and C. Harold Brown
1967 "On Uprooting, Kinship and the Auspices of Migration", International Journal of Comparative Sociology, 8: 139-64.

Trovato, Frank and S.S. Halli
1983 "Ethnicity and Migration in Canada", International Migration Review, 17: 245-67.

EDMONTON AREA SERIES

43. Perceived Risk of Occupational Injury: The Impact of Occupational Hazardousness, Type of Work, and Recent Personal Injury Accidents.
W. Andrew Harrell. September 1985.

44. Quality of the Urban Environment as Perceived by Residents of Slow and Fast Growth Cities.
Raymond F. Currie and Charlene Thacker. September 1985.

45. Moving to Get Ahead: Does it Pay?
Leslie W. Kennedy and N. Mehra. October 1985.

46. Accident History, Perceived Risk of Personal Injury, and Job Mobility as Factors Influencing Occupational Accident Fatalism.
W. Andrew Harrell. November 1985.

47. The Redistributive Effects of Lotteries in Western Canada.
John R. Livernois. February 1986.

48. Public Explanations of Unemployment in a Canadian City.
G.S. Lowe, H. Krahn, J. Tanner and T.F. Hartnagel. March 1986.

49. Effects of Unemployment on Psychological Well-being.
Wei-Jung J. Yeung and P. Krishnan. June 1986

50. Edmonton Area Study Sampling Report 1986.
Clifford Kinzel. June 1986.

51. 1987 All Alberta Study (including the Edmonton Area Study) Sampling Report.
Cliff Kinzel. May 1987.

52. Perceived Quality of Life in a Centre: Periphery Framework
J.R. Oppong, R.G. Ironside and L.W. Kennedy. June 1987.

53. The Incidence of Wife Assault in Alberta.
L.W. Kennedy and D.G. Dutton. July 1987.